

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 19 are independent and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Yoneda et al. '239 ("Yoneda"). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites in pertinent part, "a lead having a portion which protrudes from the groove portion laterally onto the surface of the lead frame body so as to be in contact with said surface" (emphasis added). The Examiner relies on element 121 as the claimed "lead frame body" and elements 155, 171 as the claimed "lead." As shown in Figure 79 of Yoneda, however, the alleged lead 155, 171 is NOT positioned on the surface of the alleged lead frame body 121 but rather is on the surface of the *resin* layer 153, noting that the claimed lead frame body is made of a metal.

In addition, the portion of the alleged lead 155, 171 which protrudes laterally from the alleged groove portion is NOT in contact with the laterally positioned surface of the alleged lead frame body 121 but rather is in contact with the laterally positioned surface of the *resin* layer 153.

Claim 19 recites in pertinent part, "wherein the multi-layer lead contacts a surface of the semiconductor chip." In contrast, the alleged lead 113 of Yoneda is spatially separated from any surface of the chip 111.

As anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that each and every element of the claim be disclosed, either expressly or inherently (noting that "inherency may not be established by probabilities or possibilities", *Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra*, 178 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 1999)), in a single prior art reference, *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Commission*, 808 F.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir.

1986), based on the forgoing, it is submitted that Yoneda does not anticipate the independent claims, nor any claim dependent thereon.

Under Federal Circuit guidelines, a dependent claim is nonobvious if the independent claim upon which it depends is allowable because all the limitations of the independent claim are contained in the dependent claims, *Hartness International Inc. v. Simplimatic Engineering Co.*, 819 F.2d at 1100, 1108 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Accordingly, as the independent claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims dependent thereon are also patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are patentable based on their own merits by adding novel and non-obvious features to the combination. In this regard, it is respectfully requested that the withdrawn claims which are dependent, directly or indirectly, on claims 1 and 19 be rejoined as being dependent on an allowable claim.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

Having fully and completely responded to the Office Action, Applicants submit that all of the claims are now in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. If there are any outstanding issues that might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

**Application No.: 10/757,388**

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Ramyar M. Farid  
Registration No. 46,692

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 RMF:MaM  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: July 30, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080  
as our correspondence address.**